DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 363 741 CE 064 980

AUTHOR	Chernow, Harneen
TITLE	Labor/Management Workplace Education Programs.
INSTITUTION	Massachusetts State Dept. of Education, Boston.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC. National Workplace Literacy Program.
REPORT NO	17437-19-150-10/93-DOE
PUB DATE	Oct 93
NOTE	20p.; For related documents, see CE 064 978-988.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; Adult Literacy; Community Colleges; Cooperative Programs; Employer Employee Relationship; *Hospital Personnel; *Labor Education; *Labor Force Development; *Literacy Education; On the Job Training; Postsecondary Education; *Program Implementation; Two Year Colleges; Unions
IDENTIFIERS	Bunker Hill Community College MA; *Workplace Literacy

ABSTRACT

This report includes two sections: (1) an overview of the issues involved in joint labor/management workplace education programs and (2) a description of such a program partnering two union locals, nine hospitals, and Bunker Hill Community College to implement a workplace-based career ladder program. The first section explains that unions and management often enter a workplace education partnership with differing agendas. Management, for example, may want the cost of workplace education to show a benefit in terms of productivity whereas labor's agenda may include a commitment to educating the membership to become more empowered at work and at home, to build the union, and to improve the livelihood of their members. However, it is still possible for management and unions to cooperate to ensure a positive outcome for all. Some areas to be considered include the following: the program's purpose and goals, what classes will be offered, who will be accepted into the program, assessment design and process, project oversight, curriculum development, and evaluation. In the second section of the report, a union-management-college partnership program is profiled, illustrating the issues raised. The program has served more than 1,200 workers and has been made possible by cooperation on the part of all parties. The report includes a list of nine resources and outlines for some of the workplace education courses offered in the hospital program. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 363 741

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Department of Education

Labor/Management Workplace Education Programs

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

October 1993

CF064580

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Massachusetts Board of Education

Mr. Martin S. Kaplan, Esquire, Chairperson, Newton

Mr. Thomas Chin, Newton
Ms. Patricia A. Crutchfield, Springfield
Ms. Marjorie Dolan, Boston
Dr. Jerome H. Grossman, Chestnut Hill
Mr. Frank Haydu, III, Dover
Mr. William K. Irwin, Jr., Wilmington
Ms. Elizabeth Kittredge, Longmeadow
Dr. Madelaine S. Marquez, Amherst
Mr. S. Paul Reville, Worcester
Dr. Richard R. Rowe, Belmont
Dr. Stacy L. Scott, Lowell
Rev. Michael W. Walker, Brockton

Ex Officiis
(Voting Privileges)

Ms. Allyson Bowen, Westminster
Chairperson, Student Advisory Council

Dr. Piedad F. Robertson, Secretary, Executive Office of Education

(Non-Voting Privileges)
Stanley Z. Koplik, Chancellor, Higher Education Coordinating Council

Dr. Robert V. Antonucci, Commissioner and Secretary to the Board of Education

Developed and Written by
Harneen Chernow

Publication Number: 17437-19-150-10/93-DOE

The Massachusetts Department of Education insures equal employment/educational opportunities/affirmative action regardless of race, color, creed, national origin or sex, in compliance with Title VI and Title IX, or handicap, in compliance with section 504.

This publication was funded in part through a grant from the United States Department of Education (National Workplace Literacy Program, Wave IV).

350 Main Street, Malden, Massachusetts 02148-5023 (617) 388-3300 • TTY: N.E.T. Relay 1-800-439-2370

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

350 Main Street, Malden, Massachusetts 02148-5023

(617) 388-3300
(617) 388-3392 Fax

bert V. Antonucci
Commissioner

October, 1993

I am pleased to present this publication developed through our Massachusetts Workplace Education Initiative. This publication is part of a series of resources developed for and by workplace education practitioners in business, education, and labor partnerships funded through our Department's Workplace Literacy Program.

These resources are the result of our commitment to strengthening the capacity, knowledge base, and quality of the field and to provide much-needed and long-awaited information on highly-innovative and replicable practices. These resources also complement the curriculum framework of staff training and development initiatives that were successfully developed and piloted in conjunction with the field during the past fiscal year and represent an oustanding example of the Department's theme: " Working Together for Better Results."

Each of these publications was written by trainers and workshop presenters who have participated in the training of new workplace education staff. All publications provide invaluable information on important aspects of workplace education programming. All documents begin with an overview of the field or current-state-of-the-art section as it relates to the topic at hand. Then, they move into the practitioner's experience. Next, the training plan of presenters is discussed. Each publication ends with a list of resources.

We are confident that with this series of publications we have begun an exciting but challenging journey that will further support workplaces in their progression towards becoming high-performance work organizations.

Sincerely,

Robert V. Antonucci

Robert V. Antonucci
Commissioner of Education

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Individuals, groups, and organizationsthat have been helpful in the development of this publication:

Bob Bozarjian, Johan Uvin
SEIU
Adult Literacy Resource Institute
System for Adult Basic Education Support
Massachusetts Workplace Education Initiative

Resource for Joint Labor/Management Workplace Education Programs

Harneen Chernow, Program Director, SEIU Worker Education Program

1. Overview of Issues

Successful workplace education partnerships in a unionized setting require a strong partnership between the union, the employer and the educational provider. This partnership must understand and take notice of the specific labor-management relationship (both current and past), the union contract, and any other variables that will effect program policies and procedures. The presence of a union means there are ongoing negotiations between the workforce and management over all issues related to wages, working conditions and benefits which can often create tension within an education program. Without special attention paid to the labor/management history at the worksite, the educational program will not be a true partnership or reflect the needs of all worksite participants. This paper will attempt to provide an overview of these challenges and present a framework for addressing each issue.

Within every workplace education partnership both management and labor enter with a clear reason and agenda for participating in the program. While both partners must commit to sharing a general mission statement and to the goal of educating the workforce, the underlying and perhaps unstated principles of why each party is participating are rarely exactly the same.

Management's agenda often includes training a more flexible workforce capable of performing a wider range of duties and meeting the changing needs of the industry. Oftentimes increased communication between workers and management, between workers and clients and between co-workers is a high priority for the company/employer

particularly when employing a multi-lingual and multi-cultural workforce. In evaluating program success management may want to perform a 'cost-benefit' analysis of the program where the costs of offering workplace-based educational programs are compared to the benefit of a better educated workforce in terms of productivity and/or service delivery.

Labor's agenda often includes a commitment to educating the membership to become more empowered at work and at home, and to build the union. Labor is also interested in improving the livelihood of their members by increasing job security and access to higher paying positions. Learning about health and safety and other rights on the job are other educational goals put forth by labor.

The educational partner as well often enters the collaboration with its own agenda. These include a commitment to particular teaching styles and philosophies, an established curriculum and/or instructional materials, and a focus on continual student attendance and ease of release time. The worker/students also have their own reasons for taking a class. This might include a goal for mobility within the institution, self-improvement or helping their children with homework.

Even with these different priorities and tensions, labor and management can have a positive experience in a workplace education program. By working together on this type of non-adversarial project, they can enhance their ability to work together on other existing more contentious labor/management problems. In addition, educational partnerships that include union involvement have their own benefits; they can fully attend to the rights of the worker/students throughout the life of the program, they can change the fabric of the work environment, and they provide a dynamic and exciting

setting for instructor participation.

Most workplace-education programs have an oversight body that coordinates activities of the project and makes decisions effecting policies and procedures. This body might be called an Advisory Board, Labor/Management Education Committee, Steering Committee, or Planning and Evaluation Team. Representatives from management (including frontline supervisors), union (including stewards and union representatives), students, and the instructors should all have permanent seats on this committee. By encouraging active participation from all groups in program development and implementation, there is greater likelihood that all groups will feel 'ownership' of the program and work to make it more of a success. In such areas as outreach and recruitment for example if supervisors and stewards have been included in program start-up, they will have a greater interest in pursuing one-on-one recruitment to encourage employees and co-workers to sign-up for a class.

In addition to a strong and active partnership, there are a many areas that must be discussed and attended to prior to the implementation of any classes. In the discussion below I am assuming that all classes are held at or near the workplace, and are offered at least partially on work time.

Purpose & Goals. It is often most effective for the union and management to work together prior to program start-up to determine a common mission statement for the program. This information must then be communicated to the educational partner. The differences in purpose should be identified and evaluated at during the initial phases of the program to insure a solid working relationship.

What classes will be offered. Problem areas: Management, the union and

educational partner may disagree on which classes should be offered. For example, management may have identified ESL as an important priority to address communication problems when it is clear to the educational partner that the workers are not yet literate in their native language which according to the educational partner might have to be addressed first or simultaneously. The union's choice for courses may reflect what the workers have expressed interest in taking while management might choose to offer what is necessary to improve productivity and/or service (job related curriculum).

Who will be accepted into the program. Problem areas: Oftentimes a union contract calls for seniority to be used when determining vacation schedules, promotions, etc. Will seniority also be used for accepting students into the classes? Management may have targeted specific workers who need to take one of the classes to assist them in their jobs. What will happen if this person has low seniority and workers with higher seniority in their department also want to take the course making it impossible for the targeted workers to enroll?

Assessment design and process. Questions to be answered include who will design the assessment, who will administer the assessment and who will have access to the results of the assessment. In a union situation there is strict adherence to student privacy where only the worker will be informed of their assessment results. Workers enter these courses with a fear that their class performance will be used to effect future promotions or job evaluations.

Project Oversight. Problem areas: If there is a problem with attendance or class performance, who will be told about these issues? Should they come up at a Steering

Committee meeting? Should management be told about the problems, or should the information go directly to the union rep? How will they be resolved? These questions all fall under the general category of project oversight which also includes determining general job descriptions for all players. For workers to play an effective role on the Steering Committee, for example, they must be prepared for potential conflict issues and taught how to best represent their co-workers in this forum. Instructors also need a clear sense of the scope of their positions *vis-a-vis* the union and the company.

Curriculum development. What will be included? What kind of role will first line supervisors play in contributing to curriculum? Will any content on unions be included? Who will make the decision whether to focus on a training curriculum vs. a education curriculum? An employer, for example, may want ESL classes to teach specific job skills (such as techniques for dealing with the public or patient-employee communication skills) while the instructor or student may have no interest in teaching or taking a class focused on work-related issues, but are more interested in a learning environment that is more in the spirit of general education. A needs assessment is often done within the workplace to give instructors additional information as to which issues the employer would like to see covered in the classes. This process of discussing workplace issues and problems must be implemented in a careful manner so as not to create additional disciplinary situations or grievances.

Evaluation. What kind of evaluation will be used? In some programs management has utilized supervisory evaluations to review student progress. Unions are typically against this mode of evaluation, and seek alternative evaluation processes to review program efficacy.

2. SEIU Worker Education Program Experience

In 1989 two locals of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) forged a collaboration with Bunker Hill Community College and nine hospitals to implement a workplace-based career ladder program. A major component of the Worker Education Program (WEP) has been identify labor shortage areas within the hospitals and develop training programs to assist hospital workers to enter these positions. The goal of the program is to give Tier 1 and Tier 2 hospital workers (e.g. service, maintenance, clerical, semi-skilled) the opportunity to gain the education and training they need to promote into the more technical Tier 3 positions (e.g. Radiography, Nuclear Medicine, Physical Therapy Assistant). WEP differs from most other workplace education programs in that courses offered range from adult basic education and English as a Second Language to college-prep to college credit courses in Allied Health to Associate Degree Internship programs.

Because many higher-level hospital positions now require an Associate Degree or particular certification or licensure, a decision was made to gear most educational offerings towards meeting workers career goals. Instructors are drawn primarily from the community college system (as Allied Health degrees are all offered through the community colleges) with additional instructors coming from the hospital workforce. The students in this program work in a wide range of service, maintenance, clerical, clinical and teaching positions. The average seniority is 12 years and the vast majority of workers are committed to a career in hospital work.

All parties entering this collaborative agreed on a variety of issues: that the vast majority of Allied Health programs are offered during the day and require full-time

attendance, making it difficult for adult workers to enroll in these programs; that because the hospital partners are primarily small community based hospitals, they have limited resources to support training for their own workforce and would benefit from a statewide collaborative effort; that long-term, entry-level employees who have chosen careers in hospitals should be given the opportunity to improve their skills and have access to higher graded positions at their workplace; that classes would be offered at the workplace with partial paid release time and a specialized counseling component would be included; and that the planning and implementation for the program would take place within a labor/management context at each site.

After initial assessments it was evident that most SEIU members needed to begin their education with basic courses to prepare them for college-level work in Allied Health programs. These courses, titled "college-prep", were presented as high school-to-college transition courses to assist workers in improving their reading, writing, communication and math skills.

A wide range of college-credit courses are also offered in health related arenas (e.g. Medical Terminology, Biology, Anatomy & Physiology, Computers). Workers are ready to take this level of course but because of internal and external barriers have yet to take that step.

While a wide range of college-prep and college-credit programs were designed to be offered in the workplace, a large-scale internship program in Medical Radiography was also scheduled to be offered. This program was designed as an innovative Allied Health project that would address the labor shortage of Medical Radiographer by training workers on-site to move into those positions. The program was also designed

to address the geographical challenge of Massachusetts where some regions offer limited Allied Health degree programs in specific areas which has created additional labor shortages.

Bunker Hill's Medical Radiography department was chosen to spearhead this program because of its history in offering an innovative and flexible part-time Radiography program. Students in the SEIU program receive 50% work-release time from their hospitals to participate in clinical placement and take classes. Core courses are taken at local community colleges. Radiography specific courses are offered using a variety of instructional methods to meet the distance learning requirements of the program. A number of courses are taught by each clinical instructor on-site, other courses are taught in a distance capacity with a designated instructor from BHCC. And some courses are taught at BHCC with students attending classes on a bi-weekly basis for an extended number of hours.

All clinical and academic work is coordinated by BHCC Medical Radiography faculty, and students are subject to the same rigorous testing and demonstration requirements as traditional BHCC students. At various times throughout the program both the Interns and the Clinical Instructors have come together for seminars at BHCC to address the challenges of distance learning, and to receive specialized professional development programs.

The project is being evaluated by the Ford Foundation through U/Mass Boston for possible national replication. While only 11 Interns were accepted into the program, there has been no attrition. This can be attributed to the flexibility of the program offered by BHCC, and the labor/management collaborative effort that has attempted to

address the challenges as they have emerged.

Most Interns will complete the program in 1994.

To oversee this project a statewide Advisory Board which includes representatives from management, labor, student/workers, community colleges, Department of Apprenticeship Training, Massachusetts Hospital Association, and WEP program staff meets quarterly. This Board is responsible for the overall planning, implementation and evaluation of WEP activities. Board members set the general direction for the program in terms of educational offerings and establishes program procedures for sharing resources and reviewing class progress. Board meetings are also an opportunity for hospitals to share experiences with each other.

In addition to this statewide body, each hospital site has its own labor/management educational committee which focus exclusively on developing and implementing a hospital specific educational program. This committee includes representatives from the hospital, union, WEP program staff, and worker/students and meets regularly throughout the year. The committee determines the classes to be offered, identifies materials to include in the courses, sets up the outreach/recruitment/assessment and acceptance procedure, addresses release time problems, locates classroom space, conducts general information sessions regarding workplace-education and hospital labor needs and provides any other additional program assistance as needed.

At those hospitals where labor and management are actively involved in these committees, the program has been more successful. WEP staff are responsible for developing outreach materials and staffing information/recruitment tables. Instructors

often participate in this process to help workers get a clear picture of what the class will entail, and to give the instructor a better awareness of the student population. Once workers sign-up for a class, the labor/management committee assists with negotiating the work release time for the students. While workers are entitled to 50% paid release time to attend class, there are still often problems when it comes to actually leaving work early. In these instances the labor/management committee gets involved to resolve the problem.

During the course a WEP counselor spends additional time with the worker/ students to assist with release time problems, or other work and personal problems which may make class attendance difficult. The counselor also helps each student develop a career and educational plan that includes identifying future job options at the hospital and locating educational resources and programs that will assist in this transition. The relationship between the worker and the instructor and the worker and the counselor are both key in terms of retention and program success.

Because SEIU has had an ongoing interest and commitment to the education and training of their members, every effort has been made to tie this program into the larger issue of job restructuring and changing requirements. In addition, some workplaces have negotiated extensive career ladder programs in which requirements for every job have been agreed upon between the union and management creating clear cut career paths for workers in all departments. Based on the negotiated requirements the labor/management committee at each hospital is able to determine the appropriate course offering to best meet the needs of the workforce. All hospital contracts also include a tuition reimbursement benefit that can be utilized for additional coursework at

outside educational institutions.

The majority of WEPs funding has come through a grant from the state Department of Medical Security Labor Shortage Initiative Fund. Because the grant is geared toward training healthcare workers WEP has been able to offer a wider range of courses then most other ABE and ESL workplace-based programs. Relying on soft money for program operation is always a challenge and in a workplace education project it causes particular difficulties. Members get involved in classes only to be told that once the funding has run out, no more courses will be offered until future funding is found.

Over 1200 workers statewide have been serviced through this program with many classes having substantial waiting lists of workers wanting to enroll. The long-term project goal is to institutionalize educational programs within the various hospitals through a labor/management agreement. Although the specifics at each site will vary, this program has led to widespread interest and support amongst the membership and the administration to continue workplace-based training.

3. Resources

Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (1992). **Closing the Skills Gap: New Solutions.** Chicago, IL: Council for Adult and Experiential Learning.

Hoerr, John (1993). A Collective Bargain: Negotiating Human Capitalism. **The American Prospect,** 12, 127-135.

Hull, Glynda (1991). **Hearing Other Voices: A Critical Assessment of Popular Views of Literacy and Work.** Berkeley, CA: National Center for Research in Vocational Education.

Marshall, Ray and Tucker, Marc (1992). **Thinking for a Living: Education and the Wealth of Nations.** New York, NY: Basic Books.

Oregon AFL-CIO (1992). **Worker Education and Training In Oregon: The Challenge for Labor.** Oregon: University of Oregon Labor Education and Research Center.3.

Sarmiento, Anthony R. and Kay, Ann (1990). **Worker-Centered Learning: A Union Guide to Workplace Literacy.** Washington, DC: AFL-CIO Human Resources Development Institute.

Service Employees International Union (1992). **Workplace Education from A to Z: A Handbook for SEIU Local Union Leaders.** Washington, DC: SEIU, AFL-CIO.

Shor, Ira (1988). **Working Hands and Critical Minds: A Paolo Freire Model for Job Training.** Chicago, IL: Alternative Schools Network.

Working Life News. Oakland, CA: Center for Working Life.

4. Presentation Outline for DOE Mini-Course

Introduction:

Focus on collaborations -- partnerships between unions, employer, and educational providers; each partner comes with their own agenda, which has a major impact on the evolution of the program and is what will be discussed in this presentation. Important to be talking with teachers and potential teachers about partnerships that involved a union.

Partnerships with union involvement:

*can be complicated
*are often political

But also:

*have the possibility of really changing the fabric of the work environment
*ensure that the rights of students are being attended to throughout the program
*are an incredibly dynamic and exciting partnership to participate in
*can be as much of a learning experience for instructors as for students

Background Questions: (ask participants)

Who here has been a member of a union?

Who here teaches in the workplace? Do you know if there is a union?

Is the union part of the educational program/partnership?

How many of you have worked in entry-level of low-wage positions for years and years without any possibility of upgrading?

What comes to mind when we talk about unions, what is a union? (have participants brainstorm their impressions of unions)
e.g. rights for working people, workplace organization, empowerment, Jimmy Hoffa

Unions are an attempt to even the playing field between the employer and employees, they are about power and about having rights on the job. Important to know this when we talk about worker education, because the tension and the struggle in these programs are about power, who has it and who is trying to get some of it. And for union members in these programs, education is about power.

Review SEIU Worker Education Program:

*joint labor/management program
*nine community-based hospitals statewide
*include mostly service and maintenance workers
*career ladders program - help workers upgrade and promote
*educational partners throughout the state - community college system
*labor/management committee at each hospital include student representation
*statewide Advisory Committee responsible for overall planning, implementation
*strong joint labor/management participation in all program phases

Competing Agendas

*strongest programs are those that have strong participation of union, management, frontline supervisors, workers and educational partner

*discuss issue of competing agendas between union, management, student and educator -- each has their own interest for participation; must agree on broad principles and goals

*understand ahead of time that even though there are different philosophies and agendas, can still work together and be a positive experience

Ask participants:
1. Why do they think union wants to participate in education program? what do they hope to get out of it? (post list)
2. Why do you think management is participating in program? (post list)
3. What are educational partners agenda/goals? (post list)
4. Student/worker goals for taking class are: (post list)

Bottom line for workplace education programs--bringing change to workplace:

* workers learn new language/communication/reading/writing skills
* become more literate in their workplace
* increase self-confidence and ability to advocate for themselves
* does management want an empowered workforce who will advocate for themselves?
*does union want to assist with developing a more 'flexible' workforce?

Competing Agendas Play Out in All Areas of Program:

What will be offered?
Which workers will be accepted?
What kind of assessment will be used? who will have access to information from assessment and class progress?
What will be taught?

What happens when worker/students don't show up for class?
What kind of evaluation will be used? who will be taught to?

As Instructors:

you are a member of the partnership/don't be passive
you should know and understand the scope and history of the program
knowing what the story is can make the whole experience work more smoothly

Helpful to find out: (prior to class start-up)

how program evolved/whose ideas it was/who found funds
where is the $ coming from -- comes with restrictions and regulations
understand/learn about labor-management history at workplace e.g. which workers are in unions, how long they've been unionized, what the tension level is)
what kind of Advisory Board will there be, who is overseeing program
process for dealing with student problems: teacher, project counselor, union rep, personnel rep
how will curriculum be developed? will students be involved, will employer/union be able to include information; what is the role of TQM in training?
what kind of evaluation will be done?

Conclusion

Review general themes
Encourage questions